

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
November 19, 2001
Revised December 3, 2001

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Mike Stepner	San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Dave Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
George S. Woodhead	Tecate Chamber of Commerce
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Julie Bugbee	Lakeside
Ken Baumgartner	McMillin Co.
Louis Schooler	Tecate CSG
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Robert Woodhead	
Thomas Cerruti	Pauma Valley

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Stacy Berger (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Non-Agenda Item: Presentation on the Tecate Subregion –

- A Tecate resident had requested a presentation be given to the committee since there were no representatives present for the East County field trip. Presentation was given by Louis Schooler, Vice-Chairman of the Tecate Community Sponsor Group.
- Tecate, USA is heavily influenced by the Tecate, Mexico population. Increased population in Tecate, Mexico means a good opportunity to increase the commercial use capacity of Tecate, USA because people want to buy American goods. Focusing commercial purpose traffic trips through Tecate, USA rather than impacting Highway 188 and Highway 94.
- Messer asked whether or not there had been traffic studies to determine if trips generated across the border were commercial trips or not. Gendron mentioned that increased employment, not residential development brings up traffic issues.
 - ❖ ***Correction made at the December 3, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:***
Gendron's statement was: due to the increase in employment opportunities, there is a need for residential development to avoid traffic issues.
- Pryde wanted to know where the people lived. Schooler replied that 90-95% of those people working in Tecate, USA live in Mexico.
- Piro asked if there were maquiladoras along the border. Schooler replied there were about 105.
- Higgins suggested that because sewer and water lines are limited, development in Tecate, USA would be difficult. Schooler said that increasing housing would be difficult because a lot of money would need to be spent on existing infrastructure. Silver identified Highway 94 as a piece of infrastructure that would need to be improved (widened), but would be a tough process. He suggested that money should be spent on Calexico, Otay Mesa and East Otay Mesa.
 - ❖ ***Addition made at the December 3, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:****Mike Thometz had stated that any increase in development would impact Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road, which the communities do not want. There was also mention of the need for design standards to be placed on the agenda.*

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for October 22, 2001
 - Pryde moved to approve. Higgins and Doyle seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.
- b) Minutes for November 5, 2001
 - Pryde mentioned that on page 2, 2nd bullet, it should read Pryor, not Pryde.
 - Pryde questioned some wording on page 7 and asked if “groundtruthing” could be defined by staff and available in writing at the next meeting.
 - Pryde wanted clarification on the use of “land values.” Higgins says it is more of a place-holder, suggesting mechanisms such as TDRs. Scarborough clarified the sentence to read “Approve the regional categories with the following densities *contingent upon a workable system of TDRs or other mechanisms agreed upon.”
 - Bowlby asked for a clarification on agricultural parcels because it is not clear in the motion. Silver suggested that an agricultural parcel meant no housing, no structures, only agriculture. There is no density and it can never have any. Bowlby called attention to the discrepancy of 1 du/20 ac with rooftops and 1 du/20 ac agricultural parcels with no rooftops. He further asked for clarification on how many parcels would be included in the 20% of the east of CWA parcels that would be allowed for 1 du/40 ac with rooftops. Messer suggested that language read “up to 20%”.
 - Doyle’s vote should have been an abstention because it was a proxy. After hearing discussion at this meeting, he would have voted yes. Final vote for the motion (Nov. 5th) in regards to Regional Categories: 13 – 2 – 0 with Gendron and Bowlby in opposition.
 - Chase points out typo that reads “1/80, 1/60 east of the CWA line” on page 4, 5th bullet. It should read 1/160
 - Chase requested a count of the number of parcels by size, west of the CWA, that we are dealing with. Staff will look into the request.

- Messer stated that she did not second the motion, Elias had seconded, to which she withdrew and Adams had seconded the motion.
- Scarborough would like to modify the minutes as discussed and approve them at the next meeting.

c) Steering Committee Update

- The Steering Committee considered industrial and commercial land use designations and used existing land use designations as a place to start. For the most part, the committee voted to use them as they exist. Replaced "Visitor-Serving Commercial" with "Rural Commercial" to allow for the quirky mixes that sometimes occur in the backcountry. The next meeting is December 15th.

Agenda Item III: Goals & Policies –

- Scarborough stated that the BIA and Sierra Club had concerns over the regional Goals & Policies, which have been referenced in past correspondence. Due to Adams's absence from this meeting, the Goals & Policies will be carried over to the next agenda. Pryde requested to have those present, state their concerns at this meeting for discussion at the next meeting.
- Pryde identified Land Use Goal I-D (add "including periodic natural wetlands") and Conservation Goal 1-G (end sentence at "limited" or add "and residents' lives and property").
- Coombs identified Land Use Goal II-A as necessary for further discussion.
- Piro asked how the Goals & Policies are going to be used. Holler responded by giving some background information on the Goals & Policies. Policies correspond to the elements used in the General Plan. Pryde asked how much "muscle" do the Goals & Policies have. Harron replied that muscles lie in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Silver suggested that Land Use Goal II-C needs to be discussed. Holler concurred that that policy needs to be revised. Stepner stated that community character and density/lot size do not match.
- Coombs stated that Land Use Goal II-D also needs to be looked at.
- Stehly stated that agriculture was placed under Land Use and Conservation and asked whether it needed to be placed in the Conservation section.
- Doyle suggested Land Use Goal V-K include the word "existing" before "road network".

Agenda Item IV: "Toolbox" Discussion –

- Scarborough asked for discussion on the "toolbox", from a policy perspective (scale, magnitude), regarding sending and receiving sites. Silver stated that the group needs a map. He asked where we stand in taking the motion that we have passed and then transporting it to a new map? Are we still on the understanding that we need outside help and will be looking to hire consultants to work with the group? Pryor replied that if we get into something above our technical expertise, then we will bring in some consultants, but we are not there yet because we do not know where growth is going to go. Silver suggested approaching it in a holistic way and that the "toolbox" should be a goal in mind to work together to achieve desired goals. Doyle asked if there had been feedback from the Board of Supervisors on the TDR/PDR discussion. Pryor indicated that the Board is not close to a TDR/PDR discussion. It is still open for discussion based on merits and costs.
- Chase raised the issue of the ability to transfer any of these credits to the City. She asked if it would be possible to transfer these credits into receiving sites within the City of San Diego. Pryor replied that there needs to be agreements with those jurisdictions. They are looking to the County to pay for infrastructure if they are taking on County densities. Chase asked that there be a fundamental focus on looking at these problems and environmental policies regionally. Coombs stated that she would hate to predicate the general plan update on agreements actually happening. The discussion should happen and a regional government to achieve it, but we should not be relying on agreements to progress. Bowlby appreciated Chase's comments and is in favor of increasing density with a good transportation option. Pryor responded that every city faces a shortfall in paying for infrastructure. The discussion will lead to the City looking to the County to pay for the necessary infrastructure. Neighborhoods do not mind density but they do not want quality of life to diminish. Stepner believes

that it is great to plan regionally but does not feel that we can just give our densities to the City because the City of San Diego has plans of their own. Higgins agreed that we could not discuss how we cooperate with other jurisdictions, but this can be done at a later date.

❖ **Correction made at the December 3, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:**

Chase's comment did not refer to the City of San Diego, but rather, cities in general. She wanted to make sure that receiving areas match areas with infrastructure and services, and not limited to the city of San Diego.

- Bowlby asked if there are legal mechanisms to reverse no development on TDR sending sites. Harron indicated that a mechanism has not been settled on.
- Stehly wanted to draw a timeline of where we are going. The first thing would be to review the population projections, receiving/sending areas, then bring planning groups on board, then start talking to the cities about receiving areas. Take it to the Board so that the Board can start negotiating with local jurisdictions. We need the Board to support the effort. There cannot be a TDR plan until we see the map.
- Messer addressed concerns of looking at a habitat map at a later date and supported the idea of Stehly's timeline. Pryor stated that we know where those habitats are but we need the distribution first so decisions can be made appropriately. There may be more than one tool in the "toolbox" depending on the area and land use.
- Pryde expressed concern with the population numbers that have been predicted. He asked if we are prepared if the current SANDAG prediction is not adequate. Pryor stated that we have identified enough land to accommodate the population increase.
- Chase clarified that she was not limiting her comments about receiving areas to the City of San Diego. We should not be limiting our efforts because it is difficult, but we need to do the right thing. A coalition is necessary and Smart Growth is the right concept. Scarborough explained that we need the Board's support to move forward with the perspective of receiving areas being in the City. Silver stated that East County cannot wait for an agreement with the Cities, but we can encourage it with bonuses that are built into the plan as a mechanism. Piro applauded what Chase said but believes it is to everyone's benefit to have as many receiving sites as possible. Cities may support preserving rural areas to a certain degree. Stepmeyer stated that regionalism needs to be pursued but it is a waste of time with piecemeal strategies (i.e. tack into land use goals) if we are serious about regionalism. If we are serious, then we should go forward with a position paper to the Board saying where we should go.
- Stehly stated that we should be spending the rest of our time on the academic side of things and looking at the map. Scarborough stated that we should be seeing the map at the meeting on December 17th. Holler emphasized that it is a *draft*.
- Bowlby mentioned 96-03 and wanted to make sure their decisions are in keeping with the GP2020 process. Pryor replied that 96-03 and GP2020 are totally separate issues. Harron stated that GP2020 will supercede Ag20 decisions. The courts have required this.

Agenda Item V: Process –

a) Status & Next Steps

- Scarborough stated that the "toolbox" discussion timing is critical and that we need the map. The next meeting will continue discussion of Goals & Policies in anticipation of seeing the map on December 17th. Doyle asked if the group could have the environmental constraints overlay on the 17th as well.
- Scarborough mentioned that there was a typo in the strikeout version of the draft Regional Categories. Under "Rural Lands", it should read "**20% of acres in private ownership...", not "inholdings". This handout needs to be consistent with the discussion on the November 5th minutes.

Agenda Item VI: Public Comments –

- Dutch Van Dierendonck stated that it is time for a mixed meeting to discuss what was talked about today. The Steering Committee and the planning groups need to come together.
- Peng Tan mentioned that every citizen should contribute to protect the environment. Landowners will fight all the way and the committee should be moderate in policies and the landowners can live with that.
- George Woodhead stated that Tecate's growth is up 114%. There have been efforts to stop growth in Tecate and to stop impacts on Highway 94. There are opportunities to reduce traffic if opportunities for commercial use are available right in Tecate, USA.